



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/778,478

02/07/2001

Carlo Amalfitano

2479.2002-001

4704

21005

7590

01/25/2005

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

TSEGAYE, SABA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2662

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/778,478 | Applicant(s) AMALFITANO, CARLO | |
| | Examiner Saba Tsegaye | Art Unit 2662 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/2/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2662

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed 09/02/04. Claims 1 and 3-24 are pending. Currently no claims are in condition for allowance.

Drawings

2. The corrected drawings (Figs. 1 and 2) were received on 09/02/02. These drawings are approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, line 10, it is not clear whether the phrase "a base station" refers to the same base station cited on line 2.

Claim 3, line 4, it is not clear whether the phrase "a base station" refers to the same base station cited in claim 1, line 2.

Claim 5, line 3, it is not clear whether the phrase "a base station" refers to the same base station cited in claim 4, line 4.

Art Unit: 2662

Claim 7, line 2, it is not clear whether the phrase “a base station” refers to the same base station cited in claim 4, line 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 4-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hou et al. (US 6,324,184) hereafter Hou in view of Spinney et al. (US 6,426,943) hereafter Spinney.

Regarding claims 4 and 11, Hou discloses a method for providing multiple grades (“**weighing factor**”; see col. 11 lines 10-31) of service in a demand access wireless communication system, in which identifying a priority level of a user requesting allocation of bandwidth for transmitting data information to a base station depending on whether a previous historical usage of resources by that user exceeds a threshold, such that, if the previous historical usage by the user is lower than the threshold, the user is assigned a higher priority level for transmitting data information, the higher priority level entitling the user use of more channels than otherwise allowed when a lower priority level is assigned and allocating bandwidth to the user depending upon the corresponding priority level so identified (**The MAC management entity may maintain a historical record of bandwidth usage for each user. Then, users who have relatively low usage levels may be given higher priority when requesting a bandwidth level that might otherwise be limited; for example see col. 11 lines 50-60**). The MAC allocates data bandwidth on channels according to the type of service. Further, Hou discloses that there may be a concern that the dynamic bandwidth allocation scheme never reduces the assigned bandwidth of a user when the user continually uses all of its assigned bandwidth. In this case some of the bandwidth assignment of user in question can be redistributed to other users

Art Unit: 2662

who use all or most of their assigned bandwidth (column 11, lines 36-46). However, Hou does not expressly disclose if the previous historical usage by the user is higher than the threshold, the user is assigned a lower priority level.

Spinney teaches that if a data byte count is greater than the threshold value, the data flow is reassigned to a lower priority queue (see Fig. 44; col. 29, lines 5-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a method that assigns a lower priority level if historical usage by user is higher than the threshold, such as that suggested by Spinney, to the method of Hou. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would optimize bandwidth utilization and provide bandwidth fairness between multiple priority levels.

Regarding claims 5 and 12, Hou discloses a method wherein the priority level for transmitting data defines a maximum continuous allocation of resources entitled to the user to transmit data information from a subscriber unit to the base station over multiple assigned traffic channels of the wireless communication system (col. 2, lines 52-56).

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Hou discloses all the claim limitations as stated above. Further, Hou discloses that it is possible to use a timing mechanism. Furthermore, Hou discloses that assigned bandwidth may be based on a subscriber unit bandwidth usage history, time of day, or other factors. However, Hou does not expressly disclose: a) detecting whether a time limit for allocated channels has been exceeded for a continuous transmission of data; and b) decreasing the priority level of a field unit to a lower level.

Art Unit: 2662

a) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a method that detects whether a time limit for previously assigned channels has been exceeded for a continuous transmission of data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would optimize bandwidth utilization and maintain a minimum bandwidth for each subscriber unit. It would provide a fair communication system to all users.

b) Spinney teaches that if a data byte count is greater than the threshold value, the data flow is reassigned to a lower priority queue (see Fig. 44; col. 29, lines 5-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a method that assigns a lower priority level if historical usage by user is higher than the threshold, such as that suggested by Spinney, to the dynamic bandwidth allocation scheme of Hou in order to ensure fair and proportional bandwidth allocation between multiple priority level. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would optimize bandwidth channel usage in communication network by tailoring the assigned bandwidth to actual user requirements.

Regarding claims 7 and 14, Hou discloses a method wherein a user is allocated resources depending on a cumulative amount of data information previously transferred from a subscriber unit to a base station (column 10, lines 25-41).

Art Unit: 2662

Regarding claims 8 and 15, Hou discloses a method wherein the threshold defines a cumulative amount of data information that a user can transmit over specified period of time without being a lower priority level (column 9, lines 45-60).

Regarding claims 9 and 16, Hou discloses that the thresholds are adjustable.

Regarding claims 10 and 17, Hou discloses that the MAC management entity maintains a historical record of bandwidth usage for each user. Furthermore, Hou discloses that assigned bandwidth may be based on a subscriber unit bandwidth usage history, time of day, or other factors. However, Hou does not expressly disclose that the historical usage of resources is determined by comparing usage over a period of at least several past days.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a method that maintains a record for at least past days. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it is an efficient way to know how often subscribers accesses the communication system, so to ensure fair and proportional bandwidth allocation.

Regarding claims 18-24, Hou in view of spinney discloses all the claim limitations as stated above. Further, Hou discloses that the management entity may be implemented in hardware and /or software.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use software-based machines. The benefit using computer-usable medium

Art Unit: 2662

device is that programs can be changed and upgraded and new features are added easily than hardware changes.

6. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hou et al. in view of Spinney et al. (US 6,426,943) hereafter Spinney and Honkasalo et al. (US 6,101,176) hereafter Honkasalo.

Regarding claim 1, Hou discloses a method of providing multiple grades of wireless service to multiple field users for communication of data between a base station and multiple subscriber units (figure 5) over one or more CDMA communication channels, each grade of service having a corresponding priority level ("**weighting factor**"; see col. 11 lines 10-31);

Hou discloses reserving a bandwidth and dividing the bandwidth into a plurality of channels (**central controller 210 allocates bandwidth on the transmission path 220 to manage communications between the subscriber units and the central controller. Path 220' may comprise one or more channels shared among the subscriber units; for example see col. 3 lines 62-67**);

Hou discloses maintaining a connection between multiple subscriber units and the base station (**See figure 5; The system maintains a minimum bandwidth for each subscriber unit; and maintains a count of the number of active users on each channel; for example see col. 8 lines 7-14 and col. 9 lines 1-7**);

Hou discloses detecting a request by multiple field units to simultaneously transmit data to the base station (**The MAC provides for collision detection and contention access, where**

Art Unit: 2662

users are requesting access to the same slot at the same time; see col. 6 lines 32-67 and col. 7 lines 1-5);

Hou discloses identifying a priority level of a user requesting allocation of bandwidth for transmitting data information to the base station depending on whether a previous historical usage of resources by the user exceeds a threshold (**The MAC management entity may maintain a historical record of bandwidth usage for each user and the MAC management entity may further allocate bandwidth according to historical profile of total channel bandwidth usage**), such that:

if the previous historical usage by the user is lower than the threshold, the user is assigned a higher priority level for transmitting data information, the higher priority level entitling the user use of more channels than otherwise allowed when a lower priority level is assigned (**The MAC management entity may maintain a historical record of bandwidth usage for each user. Then, users who have relatively low usage levels may be given higher priority when requesting a bandwidth level that might otherwise be limited; for example see col. 11 lines 50-60**) and;

Hou discloses assigning the channels for communication between the base station and subscriber units based on the corresponding priority level of requesting field units so identified, (**The MAC management entity may maintain a historical record of bandwidth usage for each user. Then, users who have relatively low usage levels may be given higher priority when requesting a bandwidth level that might otherwise be limited; for example see col. 11 lines 50-60**).

Art Unit: 2662

Hou discloses that the MAC management entity allocates bandwidth according to a historical profile of total channel bandwidth usage. However, Hou does not expressly disclose that if the historical usage by the user is higher than the threshold, the user is assigned a lower priority level.

Spinney teaches that if a data byte count is greater than the threshold value, the data flow is reassigned to a lower priority queue (see Fig. 44; col. 29, lines 5-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a method that assigns a lower priority level if historical usage by user is higher than the threshold, such as that suggested by Spinney, to the dynamic bandwidth allocation scheme of Hou in order to ensure fair and proportional bandwidth allocation between multiple priority level. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would optimize bandwidth channel usage in communication network by tailoring the assigned bandwidth to actual user requirements.

Hou and Spinney discloses all the claim limitations as stated above. Hou discloses the capability for a wireless network adaptation (col. 3 lines 55-57), but fails to expressly disclose where the communication is a CDMA communication and that the central controller is a base station and the subscriber units are units that are able to communicate wirelessly over CDMA channels.

Honkasalo discloses a CDMA based cellular network that provides a wireless connection to the subscribers for voice and data (**figure 7 shows a base station 316 with multiple mobile subscribers in the building 300: for example see col. 6 lines 59-67 and col. 26 lines 1-7**).

Art Unit: 2662

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hou's apparatus to utilize a CDMA cellular system with the base station as a central controller communicating to the subscribers through a wireless medium, as taught by Honkasalo. The motivation is that CDMA provides a wireless system that provides a relatively greater bandwidth capacity than other wireless systems. This fits the needs of increased applications for wireless data transmission, such as facsimiles and Internet access, and video transmission, as explained by Honkasalo on column 1, lines 20-30 and column 2, lines 10-25.

Regarding claim 3, Hou discloses all the claim limitations as stated above. Further, Hou discloses that it is possible to use a timing mechanism. Furthermore, Hou discloses that assigned bandwidth may be based on a subscriber unit bandwidth usage history, time of day, or other factors. However, Hou does not expressly disclose: a) detecting whether a time limit for allocated channels has been exceeded for a continuous transmission of data; and b) decreasing the priority level of a field unit to a lower level.

a) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a method that detects whether a time limit for previously assigned channels has been exceeded for a continuous transmission of data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would optimize bandwidth utilization and maintain a minimum bandwidth for each subscriber unit. It would provide a fair communication system to all users.

b) Spinney teaches that if a data byte count is greater than the threshold value, the data flow is reassigned to a lower priority queue (see Fig. 44; col. 29, lines 5-29).

Art Unit: 2662

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a method that assigns a lower priority level if historical usage by user is higher than the threshold, such as that suggested by Spinney, to the dynamic bandwidth allocation scheme of Hou in order to ensure fair and proportional bandwidth allocation between multiple priority level. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would optimize bandwidth channel usage in communication network by tailoring the assigned bandwidth to actual user requirements.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2662


however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saba Tsegaye whose telephone number is (571) 272-3091. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-5:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ST
January 19, 2005


JOHN PEZZLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER